

REMARKS

This response is filed in response to the Office Action mailed July 28, 2004. The title of the invention was objected to by the Examiner for not clearly indicating the invention to which the claims are directed. The Applicants respectfully submit that the title describes the invention to which the claims are directed. Should the Examiner maintain this objection, Applicants kindly ask that the offending language be identified and the ambiguities that are perceived by the Examiner.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hitoshi (JP Patent 407325693A). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hitoshi (JP Patent 407325693A) in view of Nishikawa (US Patent 6,108,009). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hitoshi (JP Patent 407325693A) in view of Chiabib et al. (US Patent 5,963,216). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Specifically, the cited art, alone or on combination, does not disclose “a preview window having a preview box for displaying said print data and a print data processing box operable by a user for changing said print data” as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 5 and 7.

Regarding the Hitoshi reference, the disclosure teaches a preview screen that is displayed at the time of printing ([0039]). The preview screen is executed in response to a “preview” command, given by a user that wants to view drawing data prior to printing on a printer that is different from a preset printer assigned to the drawing (claim 1, lines 5-7, [0001], [0033]). Thus, if a document that was assigned to a first printer was to be printed on a different printer, the user could preview the document to ensure the proper printing parameters translated to the other printer ([0011-13]). However, Hitoshi does not disclose the user being able to actively change any of the print data. Accordingly, Hitoshi does not disclose the processing box being “operable by user”, since the printer conversions happen automatically via pre-stored printer codes, and without user input ([0039-40]).

Secondly, the data disclosed in Hitoshi is disclosed as “preview data” that is independent from the print data, and teaches that the preview data is initially created during a processing mode ([0039]) that occurs prior to the generation of print data ([0047]). Hitoshi discloses that

the actual printer code is generated only after "printing" is selected ([0047, 0050]). Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is improper and should be withdrawn.

In addition to the above arguments, Nishikawa does not solve the deficiencies of Hitoshi for the reasons set forth in the Response dated December 10, 2003. Moreover, Chiarabini discloses a dialog box (245) that is completely separate from the preview area window (251). Accordingly, Chiarabini does not teach a preview window having a print data box operable by a user to change print size of print data as recited in the claims.


Finally, there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner. As discussed above, the Hitoshi reference is concerned with presenting commensurate print data among a plurality of different printers and print drivers. Both Nishikawa and Chiarabini disclose systems and methods for modifying document data surrounding a single printer/driver. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination (MPEP 2143.01) The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure (MPEP 2143).

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8 of the present application are both novel and non-obvious over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 be withdrawn and a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Examiner is authorized to deduct such fees from deposit account no. 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (112857-047) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY


Peter Zura

Reg. No. 48,196

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: November 29, 2004